

-11-

IV ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE HASSAN
(SIT AT CHANNARAYAPATNA)

MVC No. 2026/2024

PW: 1

Witness present and duly sworn on : 07.08.2026.

Further Examination in chief:

(Claimant closed further examination-in-chief).

On the basis of oral and documentary evidence, I pray to allow the claim petition.

Cross-examination by Sri. ML Advocate for the Respondent No.2:

1) On the date of accident, I was in the village. It is true to suggest that I have no personal information about the accident. Mohan Kumar has informed me about the accident at 8.15 pm. After receiving information of accident, we have been to Hassan hospital.

2) I have not visited the accident spot. On the date of accident, my son alone had been to Bengaluru in Bike. I came to know that while my son was proceeding from Bengaluru to our village near Goramaranahalli Gate, the Tractor has touched his bike and suffered accident. It is false to suggest

that my son has suffered accident in his attempt to overtake the Tractor and Trailer from the right side. It is false to suggest that accident taken place due to negligence of my son.

3) The offending tractor had joined with two Trailers loaded with Sugarcane. It is true to suggest that the sugarcane was loaded upto 10 feet height from tyre level. I do not know that as per Law, only one Trailer has to be joined to the Tractor. It is true to suggest that the owner of the Tractor has unlawfully joined two Trailers to the Tractor. It is true to suggest that the owners of the tractor and both trailers are different. It is true to suggest that the owner of the tractor and owner of the trailers have taken insurance from different Insurance companies. It is true to suggest that at the time of accident, the policies taken by both Tractor and Trailers were valid. It is true to suggest that the Tractor and Trailers are from Maharashtra State. It is true to suggest that the driver of the Tractor and Trailers were plying the vehicle in Karnataka State without permit.

4) My son had Driving License to ride the Motorcycle, it was misplaced. Said DL was issued by Nagamangala RTO. I do not know the details of DL of my deceased son. I have not

produced the DL of my son before the Police station or Court. It is true to suggest that in the charge sheet, it is mentioned that my son has no DL to ride the bike at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that my son was riding the vehicle rashly and negligently without holding DL and suffering accident.

5) My son was working as Cook in choultry and also working as Cab driver. I have no documents to show the avocation of my son. I have no documents to show the income of my son.

6) I have no documents to show that medical expenses incurred by me towards treatment of my son. It is false to suggest that since the accident was taken place due to the negligence and fault of my son, R2-Insurance Company is not liable to pay compensation.

7) It is true to suggest that Goramaranahalli Gate is situated on Bengaluru-Mangaluru highway. It is true to suggest that in highway there will be more vehicular traffic. It is false to suggest that my son has suffered accident due to his negligence in not observing the passing vehicles.

Cross-examination by R1:

(Since placed ex parte, no cross-examination).

Cross-examination by R3:

R3 absent. No representation. W/s not filed by R3. Cross-examination is taken as nil.

Cross-examination by R4:

R4 absent. No representation. W/s not filed by R4. Cross-examination is taken as nil.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

IV Addl. District and Sessions Judge
Hassan (Sit at Channarayapatna)